

1 MCGREGOR W. SCOTT
2 United States Attorney
3 DAVID L. GAPPY
4 Assistant United States Attorney
5 2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401
6 Fresno, CA 93721
7 Telephone: (559) 497-4000
8 Facsimile: (559) 497-4099
9
10 Atorneys for Plaintiff
11 United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff.

V.

TODD MUMMA,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00168 NONE-SKO

**STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE
TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;
FINDINGS AND ORDER**

PROPOSED DATE: April 21, 2021
TIME: 1:00 p.m.
COURT: Hon. Sheila K. Oberto

This case is scheduled for a status conference on January 20, 2021, but the parties have agreed to move this hearing to April 21, 2021. This Court has issued General Orders 611-628 to address public health concerns related to COVID-19, including the temporary suspension of jury trials and restrictions on access to court buildings. Initially the Fresno courthouse was closed through June 15, 2020, but it has since been closed until further notice.

Although the General Orders address district-wide health concerns, the Supreme Court has emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act’s end-of-justice provision “counteract[s] substantive open-endedness with procedural strictness,” “demand[ing] on-the-record findings” in a particular case. *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). “[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no exclusion under” § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. And moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at 509; see also *United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record “either orally or in writing”).

Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory and inexcusable—the General Order requires specific supplementation. Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

9 The General Orders exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7). Although
10 the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics, natural
11 disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has discretion to order a continuance in such circumstances.
12 For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance following Mt. St.
13 Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court recognized that the
14 eruption made it impossible for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United States v. Correa*, 182
15 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the September 11, 2001
16 terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency). The coronavirus is posing a similar, albeit more
17 enduring, barrier to the prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules.

In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this Court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7). When continued, this Court should designate a new date for the hearing. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

STIPULATION

24 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant, by and
25 through defendant's counsel of record, accordingly stipulate as follows:

26 1. By previous order this matter was set for a status conference hearing on January 20,
27 2021. The Court more recently has invited a continuance of this hearing if counsel do not believe that
28 anything substantial can be accomplished at the currently scheduled hearing.

1 2. By this stipulation, the parties agree that the next status conference be scheduled for April
2 21, 2021, and to exclude time between January 20, 2021, and April 21, 2021, under 18 U.S.C. §§
3 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv).

4 3. The parties agree, and request that the Court find the following:

5 a) Counsel for defendant desires additional time to consult with his client, to review
6 the current charges and conduct additional investigation and research related to the charges, to
7 discuss potential resolutions with his client, and to evaluate and potentially prepare pretrial
8 motions. In part this is because the government has continued its investigation of the crimes, the
9 government provided supplemental discovery, and counsel and the defendant will benefit from
10 additional time to consider this new material. The parties have had preliminary discussion on
11 possible resolutions of the case without a trial, and that communication is ongoing.

12 b) Counsel for defendant believes that failure to grant the above-requested
13 continuance would deny him the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into
14 account the exercise of due diligence.

15 c) The government does not object to the continuance and joins in the request.

16 d) In addition to the public health concerns cited by General Orders 611 and 612 and
17 presented by the evolving COVID-19 pandemic, an ends-of-justice delay is particularly apt in
18 this case because counsel or other relevant individuals have been encouraged to telework and
19 minimize personal contact to the greatest extent possible. It will be difficult to avoid personal
20 contact should the hearing proceed.

21 e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the
22 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the
23 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

24 f) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the
25 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the
26 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

27 g) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,
28 et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period from January 20, 2021, to April 21,

1 2021, inclusive, is deemed excludable under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i),
2 (ii) and (iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the request of the
3 parties on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action
4 outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

5 4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the
6 Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial
7 must commence.

8 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

9
10 Dated: January 13, 2021

McGREGOR W. SCOTT
United States Attorney

11
12 _____
13 /s/ DAVID L. GAPPADavid L. Gappa
14 _____
15 Dated: January 13, 2021
16 _____
17 /s/ DAN BACON
18 _____
19 DAN BACON
20 Counsel for Defendant
21 TODD MUMMA
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

TODD MUMMA,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00168 NONE-SKO

FINDINGS AND ORDER

PROPOSED DATE: April 21, 2021

TIME: 1:00 p.m.

COURT: Hon. Sheila K. Oberto

FINDINGS AND ORDER

The Court has reviewed and considered the stipulation filed by the parties on January 13, 2021, and also reviewed the record of this case. For the reasons stated in the stipulation, the status conference is continued to April 21, 2021, and the period of time from January 20, 2021, to April 21, 2021, inclusive, is deemed excludable under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the request of the parties on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 14, 2021

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE